

## OBJECTION TO THE REJECTION OF DISTRIBUTION ON MICROFILM AS A PERMISSIBLE METHOD OF PUB- LISHING ZOOLOGICAL NAMES

By JOSHUA L. BAILY, Jr.  
(*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*)

**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)528)**

(Enclosure to letter dated 24th October 1951)

It should be noted that the only reasons given for considering the question at all are those offered by the opposition. I believe that if the proponents of this petition had considered the consequences of favorable action as has the opposition, their support of it would not be so enthusiastic.

The disadvantages of suppressing microfilm in this way might not be felt for some years, but eventually they will be bound to appear. Just as the art of calligraphy became extinct in the middle ages as the result of the invention of printing from type, so is the art of printing in this way likely to be superseded within the next generation by the superior invention of microfilm reproduction.

There are three great advantages of microfilm; first, it can be reproduced more rapidly—the long delay between the submission of a manuscript and its appearance in final form can be eliminated. Second, it can be produced much more cheaply; an advantage rather to be augmented in the future than otherwise, owing to increasing costs of material, labor, and overhead in the printing business. Finally, it constitutes a more durable record. When a film shows signs of wearing out, it can be renewed at once by contact printing without the risk of typographical errors that always occur when type has to be reset.

The only objection to microfilm that I can imagine is that it is not so convenient, but all advances are inconvenient until we get used to them. The engineer brought up on the steam locomotive thinks the modern diesel to be inconvenient, and doubtless his predecessor thought the steam locomotive less convenient than the horse. Technological improvements in industry can not be held back indefinitely by legislation. I therefore request you to deny this application.

## MIKROKOPIE SOLL NICHT ALS VERÖFFENTLICHUNG IM SINNE VON ARTIKEL 25 DER REGELN ANGESEHEN WERDEN

By ROBERT MERTENS

(*Natur-Museum und Forschungs-Institut Senckenberg, Frankfurt a. Main, Germany*)

**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)528)**

(Note dated 24th October 1951)

Die Senckenbergische Naturforschende Gesellschaft hat bereits beschlossen, Mikrokopie nicht als Veröffentlichung anzuerkennen. Ich übersende gleichzeitig "Natur und Volk" 81, Heft 9, pag. 232-234, 1951, wo diese Entschliessung veröffentlicht ist.

Hierbei verweise ich auf die gleichlautende Beschlüssung der Paläontologischen Gesellschaft vom 8. September 1950. Die Veröffentlichung in der Paläontologischen Zeitschrift 24, 3/4, pag. 101-103, 1951, füge ich als Sonderdruck hier bei.